

## **REMARKS**

Claims 6-22 were examined in the Final Office Action mailed October 6, 2006, and stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph as indefinite. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the remarks which follow.

A. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph Rejection of Claims 6-22 is Addressed.

Claims 6 and 13 are rejected as having confusing data flow and omitting structural cooperative relationships. The assertion that claim 6 “is a collection of elements with a few relationships between a few of the elements” is respectfully traversed. In claims 6 and 13 it is respectfully submitted that all of the claimed elements are coupled to each other as required. However, in a spirit of cooperation, and to address the assertion that it is unclear how data flows through the circuit, claims 6 and 13 have been further amended. Consistent with the circuits shown in FIGS. 4 and 5, claims 6 and 13 now recite inputs and outputs through which the previously recited “coupled” connections are achieved. Claims 6 and 13 now recite that a subsequent element in the claim is coupled to the output of a previous element in the claim, or to an input of an element in correspondence with FIGS. 4 and 5.

With regard to the question of “where the mode signal comes from and how/where the mode control signal is connected”, it would be clear to a person of ordinary skill in the art that a “control signal” is received by a “control signal terminal” or “control signal node” in a multiplexer, so that recitation of a “control signal terminal” is superfluous and not required. Indeed, there is no requirement in patent law that every feature of a disclosed circuit be recited and all the details of coupling or operation of individual elements be recited. For example, every logic gate has positive and negative power terminals, which are routinely omitted in claim drafting. As another example, every MOS transistor has a body connection coupled to a source of supply voltage or a circuit node, and yet the body connection is routinely omitted in claim drafting. In the present case, the operational details or structures of multiplexers are known and recitations about the mode signal are just not needed in the present case.


In view of the above amendments to claims 6 and 13, a person of ordinary skill in the art will be able to understand data flow through the circuit as claimed, so that any possible indefiniteness has been addressed, with the § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejection of dependent claims 7-12 and 14-22 also addressed by the amendments to claims 6 and 13. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 6-22 is therefore respectfully requested.

B. Conclusion.

In view of the above amendments, claims 6-22 are in form for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. Should any issues remain, the Examiner is kindly asked to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

October 18, 2006



Carol W. Burton, Reg. No. 35,465  
Hogan & Hartson L.L.P.  
1200 17<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 1500  
Denver, CO 80202  
Telephone: (303) 454-2454  
Facsimile: (303) 899-7333